

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-35 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated May 19, 2004 claims 1-35 were rejected. In this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 16-18, 29, 33, and 34 and canceled claim 35. In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejected all the claims as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,505,344 to Blais in combination with Official Notice and other references under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Subsequent to an interview conducted with Applicants' representative, Examiner provided Applicants with a suggested amendment to the claims which Examiner suggested would better position the claims for allowance in light of the prior art. Applicants thank Examiner for this suggestion and have incorporated the spirit of the suggested amendment herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the claims in their present form are patentable and in a condition for allowance.

The amendments presented herein are believed not to introduce new matter, but have been amended to expedite the prosecution of the application in a manner consistent with the Patent Office Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept. 8, 2000). In making these amendments, Applicants have not and do not narrow the scope of the protection to which Applicants consider the claimed invention to be entitled and do not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.


In a telephonic interview on July 22, 2004, Applicants' representative Colleen Chien, Examiner Haresh Patel, and supervising Examiner Zarni Maung discussed the rejection of

the claims based on Blais. Applicants thank Examiners for scheduling this interview. In accordance with MPEP 713.04, the content of this interview is reflected in this Office Action Response. During the interview, Examiners and Applicants' representative discussed differences between Blais and the claimed invention. Subsequently, one or more of Examiners conducted a follow up prior art search. Over the course of the interview and in subsequent telephone calls, Examiner proposed an amendment that would be patentably distinct over Blais and any other prior art identified in the follow up prior art search. Claim 1, as well as the other independent claims, have been amended to reflect the spirit of the proposed amendment.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims as presented herein are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Hong Zhang *et al.*

Date: 8/3/04

By: 

Colleen V. Chien, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 55,062  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: 415-875-2319  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
E-Mail: cchien@fenwick.com